



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,453	05/18/2006	Johann Zimmermann	ON/4-33289A	9886
1055	7590	02/19/2009	EXAMINER	
NOVARTIS			STONE, CHRISTOPHER R	
CORPORATE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ONE HEALTH PLAZA 104/3			1614	
EAST HANOVER, NJ 07936-1080				
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		02/19/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/565,453	ZIMMERMANN ET AL.
	Examiner CHRISTOPHER R. STONE	Art Unit 1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/28/2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 8 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/02505) Paper No(s)/Mail Date
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' arguments, filed August 28, 2008, have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from previous office actions are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either reiterated or newly applied. They constitute the complete set presently being applied to the instant application.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8 are currently pending and under examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okuno et al (US PGPUB 2002/0142996) in view of Missbach (WO 01/58886 A1).

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8 are drawn to a composition comprising 2-(imidazol-1-yl)-1-hydroxyethane-1,1-diphosphonic acid (zoledronic acid) and N-[1-(cyanomethyl-carbamoyl)-cyclohexyl]-4-[4-(1-propyl)-piperazin-1-yl]-benzamide and a method of treating bone metastasis comprising administering said composition.

Okuno et al (US PGPUB 2002/0142996) teaches a method of treating bone metastasis comprising administering a composition comprising zoledronic acid (abstract and paragraph [0009]. Okuno et al does not teach the method/composition further comprising N-[1-(cyanomethyl-carbamoyl)-cyclohexyl]-4-[4-(1-propyl)-piperazin-1-yl]-benzamide.

Missbach (WO 01/58886 A1) teaches that N-[1-(cyanomethyl-carbamoyl)-cyclohexyl]-4-[4-(1-propyl)-piperazin-1-yl]-benzamide, including its maleic acid salt form, is useful in the treatment of tumor metastasis (p. 5, second full paragraph, p. 6, lines 14-21 and p. 16, compound C).

Applicant is reminded of *In re Kerkhoven* which affirmed that "It is *prima facie* obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught by the prior art to be useful for the same purpose, in order to form a third composition to be used for the very same purpose.... [T]he idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in the prior art." *In re Kerkhoven*, 626 F.2d 846, 850, 205 USPQ 1069, 1072 (CCPA 1980) Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant application to combine zoledronic acid and 1-

(cyanomethyl-carbamoyl)-cyclohexyl]-4-[4-(1-propyl)-piperazin-1-yl]-benzamide into a single composition and to administer said composition to a patient to treat bone metastasis, since zoledronic acid was known to be useful for treating bone metastasis and N-[1-(cyanomethyl-carbamoyl)-cyclohexyl]-4-[4-(1-propyl)-piperazin-1-yl]-benzamide was known to be useful for treating metastasis in general (i.e. the compounds were known to be useful for the same purpose), thus resulting in the practice of the instantly claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

Applicant argues that the claimed invention is non-obvious over the prior art because it is expected that the compounds will display additive anti-osteolytic activity as noted in Example 3 on page 29 of the instant application. This is found unpersuasive because both compounds were known to have anti-osteolytic activity (see paragraph 0002 of Okuno et al and p. 6, 3rd full paragraph of Missbach); therefore additive anti-osteolytic activity would have been expected by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instantly claimed invention. Applicant argues that Okuno et al does not teach using zoledronic acid as described in the Examples of the present Applicant. This is found unpersuasive because Okuno et al (in view of Missbach) renders the instantly claimed composition comprising the combination of 2-(imidazol-1-yl)-1-hydroxyethane-1,1-diphosphonic acid (zoledronic acid) and N-[1-(cyanomethyl-carbamoyl)-cyclohexyl]-4-[4-(1-propyl)-piperazin-1-yl]-benzamide and said composition's use in the instant claimed method for the treatment of bone metastasis obvious for the reasons noted above, regardless of the content of the disclosed Examples. Applicant's arguments with regard to Altman et al (WO 2003/020278) are moot, since the instant claims are not drawn to

the compound of Altman et al (the compound of Altman et al was amended to be removed from the instant claims) and the instant rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is not based on Altman et al.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to CHRISTOPHER R. STONE whose telephone number is (571)270-3494. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30am-4:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin H. Marschel can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

11February2009
CRS

/Patricia A. Duffy/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1645